

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

The title of the invention is not descriptive and a new title is required.

The disclosure stands objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Corisis et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0189257).

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corisis et al.*

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corisis et al.* in view of *Miyagawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,780,023).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have changed the title of the invention, and amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Also, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 2 to differently define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-8 remain pending for further consideration with claims 9-11 being withdrawn from consideration.

The Title of the Invention

The Office Action alleges that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants have presented a new title of "CENTER-BONDING PAD TYPE BGA PACKAGE HAVING SEMICONDUCTOR CHIP WITH EDGE-BONDING METAL PATTERNS FORMED THEREON." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the new title is clearly indicative of the claimed invention.

Objection to the Disclosure

The disclosure stands objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's comments as set forth at page 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Corisis et al.*, claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corisis et al.*, and claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corisis et al.* in view of *Miyagawa*. To the extent that the rejections might be reapplied to the claims as presently amended, they are respectfully traversed as being based on a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in the claims.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 2, as newly-amended, Applicants respectfully submit that *Corisis et al.* does not teach or suggest a claimed combination including at least a feature that “the edge-bonding metal patterns are in contact with both of the center-bonding pads and the connection members.”

The Office Action appears to allege that *Corisis et al.* discloses all of the features of independent claims 1 and 2 by relying upon illustrations in FIGs. 1-13 of *Corisis et al.* Applicants respectfully disagree that *Corisis et al.* anticipates the present application of independent claims 1 and 2, as newly-amended.

In fact, as shown in FIGs. 1-8 of *Corisis et al.* for example, *Corisis et al.* discloses conductive traces 45 that connect bond pads 34 and conductive elements 56 via conductive vias 44” and contact pads 47. In contrast to the present application wherein edge-bonding metal patterns 26 directly contact both of center-bonding pads 21 and connection members 30, Applicants respectfully submit that *Corisis et al.* never shows that the conductive traces 45 directly contact both of the bond pads 34 and the conductive elements 56. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that *Corisis et al.* fails to show the claimed combination including at least the feature that “the edge-bonding metal patterns are in contact with both of the center-bonding pads and the connection members,” as recited in newly-amended independent claims 1 and 2.

Applicants assert that the Office Action does not rely on *Miyagawa* to remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies of *Corisis et al.* Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that *Miyagawa* cannot remedy the deficiencies of *Corisis et al.* That is, *Corisis et al.* and *Miyagawa*,

whether taken separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least the above-described feature recited in newly-amended independent claims 1 and 2. For at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because the applied reference does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 2, as newly-amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 3-8 are allowable at least because of their dependencies from independent claim 2 and the reasons set forth above.

With no other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: February 2, 2005

By: 

Sunwoo Lee

Reg. No. 43,337

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000